

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/743,222	12/22/2003	Timothy J. Blenke	KCC 4932 (K-C 18,580) 7640		
321 SENNIGER PO	7590 05/25/2007 OWERS		EXAMINER		
ONE METROI	POLITAN SQUARE	KRUER, KEVIN R			
16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO	O 63102		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1773		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/25/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/743,222	BLENKE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Kevin R. Kruer	1773

	Kevin R. Kruer	1773					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Nor a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: 	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, wh g date of the final rejecti	ichever is later. In on.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further coi (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not desmed to pleas the profile time in both	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);					
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims. 			the issues for				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b) [will will will will will will will wi	Il be entered and an ϵ	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see attached.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
10. [_] Oulet			:				

Art Unit: 1773

Advisory Action

Applicant's arguments filed May 11, 2007 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Zhou teaches the bonding of an outer cover comprising polyethylene and a propylene layer utilizing an adhesive composition that is understood to read on the claimed adhesive. Applicant argues said teaching does not anticipate the use of dissimilar materials. The examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that polypropylene and polyethylene are understood to be dissimilar materials since said materials read on the "dissimilar material" species elected by applicant for prosecution. Applicant argues that the examples comprise compatible materials bonded together. Said argument is noted but is not persuasive because a reference may be relied upon for all that it fairly suggests and is not limited to preferred embodiments. As noted by applicant, the reference anticipates the bonding of polypropylene and polyethylene. Since said materials read on applicant's elected "dissimilar" materials, Zhou is understood to anticipate the "dissimilar" limitation of the claim.

Applicant also acknowledges that Zhou teaches the adhesive may be utilized in an ultrasonic bonding process. Applicant argues, however, that there is no teaching in Zhou that a laminate comprising a polyethylene layer and a polypropylene layer may be ultrasonically bonded together. The examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains the position that the reference, taken as a whole, anticipates the claimed invention. The examiner notes there is no evidence ultrasonic bonding results in a materially different product. The examiner also maintains the position that Zhou fairly teaches the use of

Application/Control Number: 10/743,222

Art Unit: 1773

ultrasonic bonding with any of the laminates disclosed therein. Thus, the position is maintained that Zhou anticipates ultrasonic bonding of polyethylene and polypropylene.

Applicant's arguments with regards to '668 and '672 are acknowledged but are not persuasive because the rejection does not rely upon either reference to teach the ultrasonic bonding limitation of the claimed invention. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues that the reference does not fairly enable the bonding of dissimilar materials. However, no explanation is given as to why the skilled artisan given the teachings of Zhou would not have readily possessed the knowledge necessary to make the claimed invention. Specifically, it is not clear what special knowledge was necessary with regards to the bonding of dissimilar materials that was not in possession of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin R. Kruer whose telephone number is 571-272-1510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/743,222

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 4

He R Kmer

Kevin R. Kruer

Patent Examiner-Art unit 1773